

I thoroughly reject the proposed amendments to the Bill for the following reasons.

1. The proposed amendments undermine freedom of speech (Section 16 of the Human Rights Act 2004). According to the Act "Everyone has the right to hold opinions without interference. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression." This human rights Act, like those stated in the *Naremburg* Code on informed consent, should remain enshrined within our ethics and constitution. Therefore, the amendments to the Bill restricting freedom of speech and expression are unconstitutional.
2. The terms "Misinformation" and "Disinformation" used within the proposed amended Bill (see below) has not been clearly defined and should be rejected for the following reasons.

The Introduction entitled: *"Simplified outline of the schedule"* states:

*"Where there is no registered misinformation code, a registered misinformation code is deficient or there are exceptional and urgent circumstances, the ACMA may determine a standard to provide adequate protection for the community from misinformation or disinformation on digital platform services. Digital platform providers are required to comply with misinformation standards that apply to them."*

ALL "misinformation codes" should be registered and not open to arbitrary mislabeling. I believe this statement sets precedence for individuals, such as those in ACMA, and those influencing them, to label what is "misinformation" and "disinformation"; what is "exceptional" or "urgent". It sets a dangerous precedence for manipulation of these terms, which in and of themselves, are labels that can be used to manipulate public thought and awareness.

Example of manipulation: Current mainstream messages, such as those from the ABC, and government advertising of Covid vaccines, do not protect the health of the community. Clearly, Covid vaccines have not been "safe or effective" (I say this from the data, the medical literature, and with first-hand knowledge). Covid vaccines has not stopped transmission (as they were stated to do in the media). There are no proper records of safety data; and as the vaccine was at an experimental phase they were given, and is still given, without proper informed consent. Should the messages given by ABC messages and government advertising also be labelled "misinformation and disinformation?" The medical literature clearly outlines the opposite views which our government has clearly ignored. Much of this medical knowledge has been forced onto the digital media, and much of this has been labelled "misinformation."

3. The proposed amendments to the Bill destroy the essence of democracy which is people centered. This means that information and expression should NOT be confined to the views and opinions of ACMA or their influencers.

Clearly, the digital platform provides an avenue for proper scientific debates, views and news that are more open and honest compared with mainstream media. The digital platform allows us to understand individuals' viewpoints and experiences. All viewpoints are valid, and it is not up to ACMA to decide what is "misinformation" or "disinformation."